



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 21, 2021

Principle? Biden Spoke to Gay Hollywood Exec, Then Changed His Same-sex “Marriage” Views

When famed martial artist Bruce Lee mentioned being as water and taking the shape of the vessel in which you find yourself, he perhaps was speaking about adaptability in combat. But politicians are “adaptable,” too, and this brings us to a fawning Inauguration Day *Variety* article about how Joe Biden evolved on same-sex “marriage.”

Titled “Joe Biden Changed His Mind About Same-Sex Marriage After Meeting This Hollywood Executive,” the piece tells the story of how sexual devolutionary organization the Human Rights Campaign asked then-president of HBO Michael Lombardo to host a 2012 meet-and-greet with China Joe.



Aneese/iStock/Getty Images Plus

“The event was meant to be healing” (read: pandering) writes *Variety*, as the sexual devolutionaries believed that the Obama administration hadn’t done enough to advance their agenda. Sure, Barack Obama had rescinded the Clinton-era “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” military policy in 2010 and the next year ordered the Justice Department to cease upholding the Defense of Marriage Act. But the devolutionaries wanted more, and Obama, running for re-election, wanted more support.

So “Lombardo, his spouse [sic] Sonny Ward and their two children, opened their Los Angeles home to Biden,” as *Variety* relates it. “The vice president arrived, Lombardo tells *Variety*, and instead of going outside to work the crowd, ‘He sat down and talked to our kids — and to us — as a human. Totally unguarded, totally present for my kids, in a way that moved us enormously.’”

Yes, well, we have observed that Joe has [great affection for kids](#), especially young girls.

“He was so engaged with them, Lombardo remembers, that Biden’s handlers had to say to him, ‘Enough, Joe,’ prompting him to keep moving to the group of grownups waiting to meet him outside,” *Variety* continues.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Now, sometime after that event, on May 6, 2012, Biden was asked in an interview about whether the administration had rethought same-sex “marriage.” Joe “said he deferred to Obama, but went on to mention ‘Will & Grace,’ and warmly told the story of meeting Lombardo and Ward’s kids,” *Variety* also writes. “What it comes down to, Biden said, is simple: ‘Who do you love?’” (And when the answer is “yourself,” you say whatever brings you success.)

Quite taken (in), Lombardo kept in touch with Biden, supported his 2020 presidential run, and now says of him, “I think his morality, humanity and authenticity are rare,” *Variety* informs. It’s sad when



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 21, 2021

someone doesn't know schmoozing when he sees it.

Biden is good at that, by the way, when he wants to be. But then there was the 84-year-old retired farmer who Biden immediately [called](#) a "damn liar," appeared to call "fat" and — being the [Izzy Mandelbaum of politics](#) — challenged to a strength contest at a 2019 event. There's also the worker to whom he [exclaimed](#) "You're full of s***" and, during his younger days, the guy he [challenged](#) to an I.Q. contest (LOL). When you're powerless and Joe doesn't need you and you dare question him, the mean old man comes out.

As for Biden's marriage "conversion," it was followed just three days later by Obama's marriage "conversion." Obama hadn't spoken to a Hollywood desert mystic, mind you, but [said](#) his thinking was changed by his daughters — ages *10 and 13* at the time — who just happened to find their influential tongues at about the same time Lombardo found his. Coincidence, I'm sure.

Less than a year later, do note, Hillary Clinton also experienced a "conversion" and announced that she supported same-sex "marriage." All this, to be certain, had nothing to do with the issue's changing poll numbers.

Now, "Moral issues are always complex matters — for people who have no principles," the apocryphal saying goes. Changing your views on *fundamental* issues during your advanced years, after talking to an entertainment figure or child (was that redundant?), doesn't do much to recommend you. You either didn't have conviction to begin with or, in at least, well-considered positions. Regardless, while time in a monastery may be in order, you haven't exhibited the wisdom public office *should* require.

The reality, of course, is that these politicians may not be wise, but they are Machiavellian: Their "changes of heart" are mere changes of guise designed for political gain. But this is obvious. What's more interesting here is that marriage, legally speaking, is *not a settled matter in our nation*.

For years I would address the question of whether homosexuals should be allowed to marry by saying that, yes, absolutely — and that they *always* had that right.

That is, to form the union with a member of the opposite sex that we call marriage.

"But, wait," the sexual devolutionaries would say, "that's *your* definition of marriage; other people may not agree with you." Ah, and that's the point:

The marriage battle was never one of "rights" — talking about such was putting the cart before the horse.

It was a matter of *definitions*.

Before you can debate whether or not there is a right to a thing, you have to know what that thing is. What is marriage? If we agree that it's the union between a man and woman, then there's no argument because no one was ever trying to stop any adult American from entering into such a union. But the sexual devolutionaries did argue — without ever putting forth their own definition.

That is to say, they did not steadfastly, unabashedly, and definitively say, "Marriage is the union between any two adults and nothing else, and here is the moral basis for this conclusion." No, they would then be drawing a line just like the traditionalists, wouldn't they? They would be guilty of the kind of "bigotry," "exclusiveness," and "narrowness" of which they accuse their opponents. Relativists can't have that, so all they did is imply that the traditional definition is incorrect without offering an alternative.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 21, 2021

What this means is that they never, as conservatives sloppily accused them of, “redefined marriage.”

They *undefined* it.

The problem? While sexual devolutionaries scoffed at the claim that legalizing recognition of same-sex “marriage” paves the way for polygamy and everything else, an “undefinition” excludes nothing. This is why I said that marriage is not legally speaking a settled issue. It’s just something we’re not talking about at the moment.

So there could end up being a 2045 article about how, after talking to her kids, President Malia Obama realized that opposition to zoophilia and human-animal “marriage” was an issue of “stigma rather than legal rights” (that is, if the Republic still exists).

As for malleable Joe and the Hollywood-exec story, I shudder to think what Biden’s views on torturing dissidents might be after talking to China’s President Xi.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe